

**Gunnison Basin Wild and Scenic Stakeholder Group**  
**Bell Heddles Recreation Center**  
**530 Gunnison River Drive, Delta, Colorado**  
**January 10, 2011**  
**7:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.**  
**DRAFT NOTES**

## **SUMMARY**

---

The meeting began with a welcome to all and approval of the meeting's objectives and agenda.

Decision regarding how the group would finalize their recommendations to BLM resulted in the group accepting the proposal presented at the last meeting. The following is quoted from the report (broken into steps for ease of reading):

1. Every participant (in subgroup or stakeholders group) should be allowed to express their proposals and concerns, with all being cited, followed by a thumbs up – thumbs down measure of level of agreement.
2. If consensus is reached, move on.
3. If consensus is not reached, continue discussion with option to reassign the task to the subgroup to work toward agreement.
4. The subgroup would then make recommendation to the larger stakeholder group.
5. Another thumbs up- thumbs down would be taken by the stakeholders' group.
6. If no consensus is reached, then more discussion with all parties noting concerns.
7. After a third thumbs up – thumbs down, if no consensus is reached then there should be a majority recommendation and minority recommendation from the two positions.

Subgroup makeup: "Future subgroup meetings should offer an invitation to all larger stakeholder group members to participate in the subgroup meetings, after providing a list of the diverse current participants. (it will be important to keep the subgroup at a workable size.)"

WSR non-suitable recommendations were agreed upon for Deep Creek and West Fork, Terror Creek. Potter, Monitor, Roubideau segments 1 & 2, and Gunnison River segment 2 were referred to the subcommittee for further analysis.

### *Next Full Stakeholder Meetings:*

**Bill Heddles Recreation Center, 530 Gunnison River Drive**  
**Monday, January 24, 7pm – 9pm**  
**Monday February 7, 7pm – 9pm**

### *Subgroup Meeting:*

**Delta Performing Arts Center, 822 Grand Ave.**  
**Friday January 21, 7:00 – 9:00**

### *Homework Assignments:*

- BLM to get information from the CNRHP on vegetation classifications by January 20 and will distribute to the group.
-

## **DETAILS**

### *Introductions*

Following introductions (copy of sign-in sheet attached), facilitator Callie Hendrickson received approval of meeting objectives and agenda.

#### Meeting Objectives:

- Agreement on how the group will proceed with developing a consensus recommendation to the BLM
- Identify the group's management recommendation to BLM for each non-NCA segment
- Set meeting schedule through February 15th.

### *Workgroup Finances Update*

Dave Kanzer reported State had committed to supporting the process but their funding is dependent on meaningful participation from the stakeholders. No stakeholder contributions have been received since the last meeting. However two people in the audience noted that they had sent checks to CRWCD. Participants were also reminded that they could write checks that evening, payable to the Colorado River District.

### *Identify Steps for Consensus Development of Recommendations*

Callie emphasized the following if the stakeholder group decided to utilize a subgroup.

- Smaller numbers are easier to work through difficult discussions. Recommendation is 10 – 15 individuals.
- The subgroup will do research and work together to find consensus on a recommendation to be brought to the full stakeholder group.
- The full stakeholder group is the only group that can make a recommendation to BLM (not the subgroup)

Callie reviewed the process that was presented at the December 20, 2010 meeting regarding how to move the process forward

Discussion ensued regarding the makeup of the sub-group. Comments pro and con were issued. It was determined that since most interests were already represented in the larger group that it would be best to move ahead. If consensus for each segment could not be reached at this meeting, then those segments needing more discussion would go to the sub-group. The make-up of the subgroup would be determined once it was established that a sub-group would be needed.

Group accepted the smaller group's recommendations presented in the report at the December 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. (Stated in the summary above.)

### *Segment Recommendations:*

#### *Discussion:*

Since some of the segments up for discussion have "vegetation" listed as one of the ORVs, Callie asked Barb Sharrow to speak to the new information coming from the Colorado Natural Heritage Program (CNHP).

Barb stated BLM has been relying on the Colorado Natural Heritage Program (CNHP) for vegetation classification they have now learned is outdated. The CNHP is updating their information and has promised to send it to Barb by January 20. If the status for these vegetative ORVs is changed to G-3, it may no longer be considered as WSR eligible.

Some group members felt that a true determination could not be made today, that it would be best to wait for the updated information from CNHP. Others wanted to move forward anyway, and see if any of the segments needed additional discussion.

Callie recommended that they go through the remaining segments to see if there was consensus. Those segments needing more discussion would be sent to the smaller group.

She also reminded the group that these seven segments are non-NCA designation, and that the recommendations must go to the BLM by February 15. The other segments are within the NCA and those recommendations must be in by April 15<sup>th</sup>.

### ***Deep Creek***

Callie summarized the characteristics of the previous input.

Members of the group offered:

- The segment was not manageable by BLM do to its length (.58 miles of BLM)
- Area land owners are managing the segment well enough already
- It contains power lines and access roads
- The water dries up in the creek many years

Barb Sharrow, BLM, offered that even if there are power lines, the segment could still be classified as recreational.

A call for agreement regarding the suitability of Deep Creek as “wild and scenic” determined a unanimous decision that Deep Creek is not suitable.

### ***West Fork, Terror Creek***

Callie summarized the characteristics of the previous input.

Representatives from the Division of Wildlife provided detailed information regarding sampling of fish in this stream. Fish sampling has been done on this creek for five of the last six years. Sampling has consistently found Cutthroat Trout in this stream. When asked about details of the sampling, DOW personnel stated that the sampling had been done on National Forest land, not BLM land. However, the fish are thriving in this stream in many different places.

The State Division Water Engineer, Bob Hurford, stated that water is diverted into the West Fork to keep it from drying up but it still could in drought years.

A call for agreement regarding the suitability of Terror Creek as “wild and scenic” determined a unanimous decision that Deep Creek is not suitable.

### ***Potter Creek***

Callie summarized the characteristics of the previous input.

The only listed ORV for this segment is vegetation. A question asked of Barb Sharrow was, if the vegetation is deemed a G-3, is it still eligible for “wild and scenic” designation. Barb responded that no, it would not be eligible.

It was noted that one individual had asked for recreation and wildlife ORVs to be considered by BLM.

Discussion ensued regarding what makes an ORV. BLM’s response was:

- unique
- exemplary
- rare
- it would be something cited on websites and in guidebooks that would make the area appealing not only to locals but to travelers from across the nation.

Comments from other stakeholders included:

- provides a unique opportunity in that no one else is there
- great for hiking and getting back to nature
- it is very scenic
- 100% federal land along this stretch, ideal for designation
- if we put it on the map now, other people will come and muck it up

Callie called for show of thumbs regarding if the group thought the segment should be WSR suitable. There were some who thought it was and others who thought it wasn’t. Per earlier discussions, this segment now goes to the smaller sub-group. Also, we don’t have all the information on this segment, as the vegetation information is still being updated by CNHP. Steve Smith volunteered to bring more details about why this segment should be considered to have recreation and wildlife ORVs to the subgroup.

Callie reminded the group that the sub-group will be tasked with doing more research and come up with a recommendation for the larger group to consider. The CNHP information will be provided as quickly as BLM or the facilitators receive it.

### ***Monitor Creek***

Callie summarized the characteristics of the previous input.

The single current ORV on this segment is vegetation, so it is in the same situation as Potter Creek.

Comments from the stakeholders included:

- would like recreation and wildlife opportunities added as ORVs
- there are no oil or gas leases on this segment
- BLM confirmed that they can adjust the boundary to accommodate private land

Callie called for show of thumbs regarding if the group thought the segment should be WSR suitable. There were some who thought it was and others who thought it wasn’t. This segment was referred to the sub-group. Also, we don’t have all the information on this segment, as the vegetation information is still being updated by CNHP. Steve Smith volunteered to bring more details about why this segment should be considered to have recreation and wildlife ORVs to the subgroup.

### ***Roubideau Creek, Segment 1***

Callie summarized the characteristics of the previous input.

ORVs on this segment include recreational, wildlife, cultural and vegetation. The current classification for this segment is “wild.” Again, the vegetation ORV will be reviewed by BLM once they receive CNHP classification update.

Mrs. Boyd requested her private land be removed from WSR suitability. The BLM agreed.

Callie called for show of thumbs regarding if the group thought the segment should be WSR suitable. There were some who thought it was and others who thought it wasn't. This segment was referred to the smaller sub-group.

### ***Discussion***

At this point, Callie asked that the group make a determination as to who would sit on the sub-group. She said that due to time limitations, discussions on the final two segments would need to wait while this sub-group was formed.

The group determined that the makeup of the committee was identified in the report they accepted earlier in the meeting. The makeup of the committee is anyone interested in participating.

The group wanted to see if there was agreement on the remaining non-NCA segments.

### ***Roubideau Creek, Segment 2***

Callie quickly summarized the characteristics of the previous input.

The group asked for an up-or-down vote on this segment. Callie called for show of thumbs regarding if the group thought the segment should be WSR suitable. There were some who thought it was and others who thought it wasn't. This segment was referred to the sub-group.

### ***Gunnison River, Segment 2***

Callie quickly summarized the characteristics of the previous input.

Callie called for show of thumbs regarding if the group thought the segment should be WSR suitable. There were some who thought it was and others who thought it wasn't. This segment was referred to the sub-group.

### ***Meeting Dates:***

After much discussion, Richard Connell agreed that he would get the sub-group together. They tentatively planned for Friday, January 21, time and place to be determined. Callie asked that Richard send her the information, and she would see that all group members received the information. The sub-group chose not to have facilitation.

Callie recommended that the full stakeholder group meet next on January 24 and February 7. Group agreed they prefer this Recreation Center location.